

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,238	04/12/2005	Yasuyuki Tomiyama	259619US0PCT	9016
OBLON, SPIN	7590 06/12/200 VAK, MCCLELLAND	EXAM	EXAMINER	
1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			STULII, VERA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/12/2009	EL ECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Interview Summary

 Application No.
 Applicant(s)

 10/510,238
 TOMIYAMA ET AL.

 Examiner
 Art Unit

 VERA STULII
 1794

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) \(\text{VERA STULII (PTO)}. (3) \text{James Kelly (Appl. Rep.)}. (4) . . (4) . . \text{Veinstein (PTO)}. (4) . . \text{Veinstein (PTO)}. (4) . . \text{Veinstein (PTO)}. \text{Veinstein (PTO)}. \text{Veinstein (PTO)}. \qq						
(2) Steve Weinstein (PTO). Date of Interview: 04 May 2009. Type: a ☐ Telephonic b ☐ Video Conference o ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2 ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If Yes, brief description: ☐ . Claim(s) discussed: 5. Identification of prior art discussed: Morey (US 5.316.779, Cho et al (US 4.105.802). Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative urged that the antifoaming agent of Morey stavs on the surface of the cup and Cho discloses sugar, but not aspartame. The Examiner noted that the rejection substitutes one conventional antifoaming agent for another and how it is applied is also conventional. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)	All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTC) personnel):				
Date of Interview: 04 May 2009. Type: a Telephonic b Video Conference c Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2 applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d Yes e No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 5. Identification of prior art discussed: Morey (US 5.316,779, Cho et al (US 4,105,802). Agreement with respect to the claims f was reached. g was not reached. h N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative urged that the antifoaming agent of Morey stays on the surface of the cup and Cho discloses sugar, but not aspartame. The Examiner noted that the rejection substitutes one conventional antifoaming agent for another and how it is applied is also conventional. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)	(1) <u>VERA STULII (PTO)</u> .	(3) James Kelly (Appl. Rep.).				
Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 5. Identification of prior art discussed: Morey (US 5.316.779, Cho et al (US 4.105.802). Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative urged that the antifoaming agent of Morey stays on the surface of the cup and Cho discloses sugar, but not aspartame. The Examiner noted that the rejection substitutes one conventional antifoaming agent for another and how it is applied is also conventional. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)	(2) Steve Weinstein (PTO).	(4)				
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) □ applicant 2) □ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) □ Yes e) ☑ No. If Yes, brief description: □ Claim(s) discussed: 5. Identification of prior art discussed: Morey (US 5.316.779, Cho et al (US 4.105.802). Agreement with respect to the claims f) □ was reached. g) ☑ was not reached. h) □ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative urged that the antifoaming agent of Morey stays on the surface of the cup and Cho discloses sugar, but not aspartame. The Examiner noted that the rejection substitutes one conventional antifoaming agent for another and how it is applied is also conventional. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)	Date of Interview: 04 May 2009.					
If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 5. Identification of prior art discussed: Morey (US 5.316.779, Cho et al (US 4.105.802). Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) \[\] N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative urged that the antifoaming agent of Morey stays on the surface of the cup and Cho discloses sugar, but not aspartame. The Examiner noted that the rejection substitutes one conventional antifoaming agent for another and how it is applied is also conventional. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)		2) applicant's representative]				
Identification of prior art discussed: Morey (US 5,316,779, Cho et al (US 4,105,802). Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative urged that the antifoaming agent of Morey stays on the surface of the cup and Cho discloses sugar, but not aspartane. The Examiner noted that the rejection substitutes one conventional antifoaming agent for another and how it is applied is also conventional. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)		e)⊠ No.				
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative urged that the antifoaming agent of Morey stays on the surface of the cup and Cho discloses sugar, but not aspartane. The Examiner noted that the rejection substitutes one conventional antifoaming agent for another and how it is applied is also conventional. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)	Claim(s) discussed: 5.					
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative urreed that the antifoaming agent of Morey stays on the surface of the cup and Cho discloses sugar, but not aspartame. The Examiner noted that the rejection substitutes one conventional antifoaming agent for another and how it is applied is also conventional. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)	Identification of prior art discussed: Morey (US 5.316,779, Cho et al (US 4.105,802).					
reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative urged that the antifoaming agent of Morey stays on the surface of the cup and Cho discloses sugar, but not asparlame. The Examiner noted that the rejection substitutes one conventional antifoaming agent for another and how it is applied is also conventional. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)	Agreement with respect to the claims f) \square was reached.	g)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N/A.				
INTERVIEW. (See INFEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MALLING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.						
/Stave Weinstein/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794						